

City of Las Vegas

AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2007

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ITEM DESCRIPTION: ABEYANCE - GPA-16578 – APPLICANT/OWNER: NEW VISTA RANCH, INC.

THIS ITEM WAS HELD IN ABEYANCE FROM THE DECEMBER 20, 2006 CITY COUNCIL MEETING AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT.

**** CONDITIONS ****

Staff recommends DENIAL. The Planning Commission (6-0-1/sd vote) recommends APPROVAL.

**** STAFF REPORT ******PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This is a request to amend a portion of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan of the Master Plan from DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) to PCD (Planned Community Development).

The proposed development does not meet the intent of the PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation. The project is a large scale development located in a primarily single-family residential neighborhood. As the project does not meet the intent of the General Plan, denial of this request is recommended.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
11/16/06	The Planning Commission recommended approval of companion items ZON-16580 and SDR-16581 concurrently with this application.
11/16/06	The Planning Commission voted 6-0-1/sd to recommend APPROVAL (PC Agenda Item #11/ng).
<i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i>	
There is an active business license on the property for a homeless shelter/rescue mission.	
<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>	
06/01/06	A pre-application meeting was held. It was noted that a drainage study, off-site improvements, and a neighborhood meeting would be required. Trails may be required.
<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>	
09/26/06	<p>A neighborhood meeting was held at Silverstone Golf Club, 8600 Cupp Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada. In attendance were five members of the applicant's team, a Council liaison, one staff member, and 17 members of the public. The following concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be no retail or commercial uses on the site • The facilities should not be rented to the general public • Financial support for the facility (and whether they would need to add commercial uses to support the operating costs of the facilities) • The height of the structures are excessive and don't fit in with the rural neighborhood • Concerns about the number of driveways/traffic on Rainbow • Residents would prefer to see the number of parking spaces reduced • The parking lot shouldn't be paved - it should be left in a natural state so that it blends in with the rural character of the neighborhood

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about drainage across the site and the existing drainage problems at Rainbow and Whispering Sands <p>The applicant agreed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the gym will be 35' high; all other structures will be under 30' high Buildings will have a residential appearance Main access to the site will be from Grand Teton, with overflow access from Rainbow The applicant will submit a Variance application for a 50% parking reduction The trail feature along Rainbow will be increased to 25' in width to allow horse path per City approval Parking lot light will be low-intensity, downward-directed fixtures with the height of the fixtures as low as the City will allow The applicant will request that there be no street lighting (rural standards), subject to Public Works and City approval The applicant will attempt to architecturally reduce the massing of the community center/recreation center Any change in use will require a full public hearing/notification process
--	---

Details of Application Request***Site Area***

Gross Acres	15.05
Net Acres	14.80

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Undeveloped Homeless Shelter	DR (Desert Rural Density Residential)	U (Undeveloped) [DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) land use designation]
North	Single-Family Residential	PCD (Planned Community Development)	R-PD3 (Residential Planned Development – 3 Units Per Acre)
South	Undeveloped	Clark County (RNP)	Clark County
East	Undeveloped	Clark County (RE) and (RNP)	Clark County
West	Orchard	Clark County (RE)	Clark County

<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Area Plan		X	
<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Purpose and Overlay Districts	X		
PD Planned Development District	X		Y
Trails	X		Y
Rural Preservation Overlay District		X	N/A
Development Impact Notification Assessment		X	N/A
Project of Regional Significance		X	N/A

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

<i>Existing Zoning</i>	<i>Permitted Density</i>	<i>Units Allowed</i>	<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	<i>Permitted Density</i>	<i>General Plan</i>	<i>Permitted Density</i>
U (Undeveloped) [DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) land use designation]	2.49 Units Per Acre	37 Units under the current designation	PD (Planned Development)	8 Units Per Acre	PCD (Planned Community Development)	8 Units Per Acre 120 units under the proposed designation

ANALYSIS

The PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation is intended to be used primarily for residential development. This land use designation is also intended to be used for commercial, public facilities and office developments when the development is used as a buffer. The proposed development does not meet the intent of the PCD land use designation. The project is a large scale development located in a primarily single-family residential neighborhood. As the project does not meet the intent of the General Plan, denial of this request is recommended.

FINDINGS

Section 19.18.030.I of the Las Vegas Zoning Code requires that the following conditions be met in order to justify a General Plan Amendment:

1. The density and intensity of the proposed General Plan Amendment is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations,

2. The zoning designations allowed by the proposed amendment will be compatible with the existing adjacent land uses or zoning districts,
3. There are adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed General Plan Amendment; and
4. The proposed amendment conforms to other applicable adopted plans and policies that include approved neighborhood plans.

In regard to “1”:

The proposed use as an assisted living center with a community recreational facility is considered too intense for the adjacent land uses. The area is primarily single-family residential and a project of this size is out of character with the surrounding uses and land use designations.

In regard to “2”:

The PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation correlates with the PD (Planned Development) District. The PD (Planned Development) district allows for a variety of uses and is intended to promote creative design incorporating multiple uses on large tracts of land that assist in buffering small infill tracts and adjacent uses. The proposed project does not act as a buffer. Rather the proposed development is a large development in the midst of a single-family residential area. Therefore; the proposed project is considered inappropriate for this location and the companion Rezoning to a PD (Planned development) District is also considered inappropriate.

In regard to “3”:

The site gains access from Grand Teton Drive a 120-foot Parkway Arterial. This street will provide adequate access to and from the proposed development. A secondary point of ingress/egress is provided from Rainbow Boulevard. This access point is proposed to be gated and will only be used for special events.

In regard to “4”:

The proposed General Plan Amendment is not affected by any other plans or policies. Although not required in the PD (Planned Development) zoning district the site does not meet the requirements of Title 19.12 for similar development, as designed. Conditions of approval have been added to the Site Development Plan review addressing these issues.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

There were eight speakers in protest at the Planning Commission meeting.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED 8

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 13

SENATE DISTRICT 9

NOTICES MAILED 138 by Planning Department

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0